



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*ml*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/000,100	04/04/97	SMALL	74892MSS

MILTON S SALES  
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY  
PATENT LEGAL STAFF  
ROCHESTER NY 14650-2201

LM02/0305

EXAMINER  
WHITE, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2712	

DATE MAILED: 03/05/99

*3*

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/833,106

Applicant(s)

Small

Examiner

Mitchell White

Group Art Unit

2712



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 26, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2712

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

1. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on 4/4/97 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. (US 5,040,068).

Regarding claim 1, Parulski et al. discloses, in figure 5, a digital camera (col. 4, lines 38-42) which is used with printer module (176) which receives processed colors and predetermined printing characteristics (col. 8, lines 45-48); a CCD to capture images (col. 3, lines 38-41); a digital image processor (168) with a program memory (172) for further processing the image by performing transceiver processing such as data compression and format conversion; printer processing such as interpolation, color and toner scale correction; and electronic darkroom processing such as (col. 7, line 55 - col. 8, line 2). Figure 5 does not explicitly illustrate that the

Art Unit: 2712

image pickup unit includes an image processor for initially processing the image. However, the image pickup unit of figure 2 does illustrate the use of a signal processing section (84) which may be added for performing the initial processing such as color separation, white balance, gamma correction, and color filter interpolation (col. 5, lines 57-68). It was not explicitly stated that the signal processing section includes a program memory however it would have been obvious to include a memory in order to perform the many operations of the processor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the processor of figure 2 into the image pickup unit of figure 5 to initially process the image.

Regarding claim 2, Parulski et al. discloses, in figure 5, a digital image processor (168) which has a program memory (172) that performs the printer processing for the color correction, tone scale correction, and pixel correction for the printer (col. 8, lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 3, Parulski et al. discloses a digital image processor (168) for further processing the image by performing transceiver processing such as data compression and format conversion; printer processing such as interpolation, color and toner scale correction; and electronic darkroom processing such as cropping and color and tone alteration (col. 7, line 55 - col. 8, line 2) and a signal processing section (84) which may be added for performing the initial processing such as color separation, white balance, gamma correction, and color filter interpolation (col. 5, lines 57-68).

Claim 5 is considered substantively equivalent to claim 1.

Claim 6 is considered substantively equivalent to claim 2.

Art Unit: 2712

Claim 7 is considered substantively equivalent to claim 3.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al. (US 5,040,068) in view of Ichikawa (US 5,717,839).

Regarding claim 4, Parulski et al. discloses in figure 5, a digital camera (col. 4, lines 38-42) which is used with printer module (176) which receives processed colors and predetermined printing characteristics (col. 8, lines 45-48); a camera interface (140); a CCD to capture images (col. 3, lines 38-41); a digital image processor (168) with program memory (172) for further processing the image by performing transceiver processing such as data compression and format conversion; printer processing such as interpolation, color and toner scale correction; and electronic darkroom processing such as (col. 7, line 55 - col. 8, line 2). Figure 5 does not explicitly illustrate that the image pickup unit includes an image processor for initially processing the image. However, the image pickup unit of figure 2 does illustrate the use of a signal processing section (84) which may be added for performing the initial processing such as color separation, white balance, gamma correction, and color filter interpolation (col. 5, lines 57-68). It was not explicitly stated that the processor include a program memory however it would have been obvious to include a memory in order to perform the many operations of each processor.

Art Unit: 2712

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the processor of figure 2 into the image pickup unit of figure 5 to initially process the image. The printer interface of printer module (176) transmits processed images to the printer (col. 8, lines 45-49) but does not receive process color or printing process parameters from the printer. However, Ichikawa discloses a camera/printer system that transmits processed images to the printer and receives process color information (col. 7, lines 11-25) and printing process information (col. 7, lines 11-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Parulski et al. as taught by Ichikawa to provide selectivity in printers which may be used.

Claim 8 is considered substantively equivalent to claim 4.

6. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703) 308-5399 (for informal or draft communications, please label

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121

Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2712


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mitchell White whose telephone number is (703) 305-8155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

MLW

February 26, 1999

  
Wendy Garber  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2700